

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action of May 28, 2009, claims 1-13, 16-18 and 24-25 are rejected. Additionally, claims 14, 15 and 19-23 are objected to. In response, claims 1-4, 7, 9-12, 15, 18, 20 and 21 have been amended, claims 13, 14, 16, 17 and 19 have been canceled and new claims 26-30 have been added. Support for the new claims 26-30 is found in Applicant's specification at, for example, original claims 10, 11, 13, 14, 18 and 24. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the claim amendments and the below-provided remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's review of and determination that claims 14, 15 and 19-23 recite allowable subject matter. In particular, the Office Action stated that claims 14, 15 and 19-23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, claim 7 has been amended to include similar limitations to claim 19. Because of the similarities between claim 7 and claim 19, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 7 recites allowable subject matter. Claims 8 and 9 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 7. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 8 and 9 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 7.

Additionally, independent claim 10 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 13 and 14 except the phrase "the contents of the output register being used for reading the data" of claim 13. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 10 recites allowable subject matter. As a result of the amendments to claim 10, claims 13 and 14 have been canceled and claim 15 has been amended to reflect the correct claim dependency. Dependent claims 11, 12 and 15 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 10. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 11, 12 and 15 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 10.

Independent claim 18 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 19. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 18 recites allowable subject

matter. As a result of the amendments to claim 18, claim 19 has been canceled and claims 20 and 21 have been amended to reflect the correct claim dependency. Dependent claims 20-25 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 18. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 20-25 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 18.

New claims 26-30 have been added. Independent claim 26 includes similar limitations to claim 14. Because of the similarities between claim 26 and claim 14, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 26 recites allowable subject matter. Dependent claims 27-30 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 18. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 27-30 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 26.

Additionally, Applicant notes that claims 1-4, 7, 9-12, 15, 18 and 20 have been amended to correct informalities. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7-12, 15, 18 and 20-30 recite allowable subject matter and are now in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-13, 16-18 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Kommerling et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,005,733, hereinafter “Kommerling”). As described above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7-12, 15, 18 and 20-30 recite allowable subject matter and are now in condition for allowance. Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-6 are not anticipated by Kommerling for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to recite in part “*a sense circuit comprising a register configured to store selected bits of the plurality of magnetically-responsive nodes.*” Support for the amendment to claim 1 is found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, original claim 1, Fig. 1 and the paragraph between page 4, line 27 and page 5, line 4. Applicant respectfully asserts that Kommerling fails to disclose the above-identified limitation of amended claim 1.

In particular, Kommerling discloses a sense amplifier (300). (See Fig. 3 and column 9, lines 20-25). The Office Action suggests that the sense amplifier (300) is equivalent to a “*sense circuit*” of claim 1. (See pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action). However, Kommerling fails to disclose that the sense amplifier (300) includes a register to store bits. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Kommerling fails to disclose “*a sense circuit comprising a register configured to store selected bits of the plurality of magnetically-responsive nodes,*” as recited in claim 1.

Because Kommerling fails to disclose all of the limitations of amended claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Kommerling.

Dependent Claims 2-6

Claims 2-6 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 2-6 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl J. Knudsen

Date: June 30, 2009

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Reg. No. 43,654

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111